



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MAIL

SEP 21 2005

DIRECTOR OFFICE  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Michael B. Johannesen, Esq.  
Lowenstein Sandler, P.C.  
65 Livingston Avenue  
Roseland NJ 07068

In re Application of: PHENIX, et al.  
Application No. 10/667,650  
Filed: September 22, 2003  
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR  
REPRESENTING A RELATIONAL  
DATABASE AS A JAVA OBJECT

DECISION ON PETITION  
TO MAKE SPECIAL  
(ACCELERATED EXAMINATION)  
UNDER M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII)

This is a response to the petition filed 22 September 2003 under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) and M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII): Accelerated Examination, to make the above-identified application special.

The Petition is **DISMISSED**.

M.P.E.P. §708.02, Section VIII which sets out the prerequisites for a grantable petition for Accelerated Examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) states in relevant part:

A new application (one which has not received any examination by the examiner) may be granted special status provided that applicant (and this term includes applicant's attorney or agent) complies with each of the following items:

- (a) Submits a petition to make special accompanied by the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(h);
- (b) Presents all claims directed to a single invention, or if the Office determines that all the claims presented are not obviously directed to a single invention, will make an election without traverse as a prerequisite to the grant of special status;
- (c) Submits a statement(s) that a pre-examination search was made, listing the field of search by class and subclass, publication, Chemical Abstracts, foreign patents, etc. The pre-examination search must be directed to the invention as claimed in the application for which special status is requested. A search made by a foreign patent office satisfies this requirement;
- (d) Submits one copy each of the references deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims if said references are not already of record; and
- (e) Submits a detailed discussion of the references, which discussion points out, with the particularity required by 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and (c), how the claimed subject matter is patentable over the references.

In those instances where the request for this special status does not meet all the prerequisites set forth above, **applicant will be notified and the defects in the request will be stated.** The application will remain in the status of a new application awaiting action in its regular turn. In those instances where a request is defective in one or more respects, applicant will be given one opportunity to perfect the request in a renewed petition to make special. If perfected, the request will then be granted. If not perfected in the first renewed petition, any additional renewed petitions to make special may or may not be considered at the discretion of the Technology Center (TC) Special Program Examiner.

The petition filed 22 September 2003 fails to adequately meet requirement (e) of the criteria set forth above. The discussion of the references does not point out with the particularity required by 37 CFR 1.111(b) and (c) how the claimed subject matter is patentable over the references.

The statement purporting to distinguish independent claim 1 from each reference recites all of the limitations of claim 1. I.e., the statement purports that the entirety of claim 1 is not taught by any of the references deemed most closely related. Such a statement is not a sufficient detailed description. (It is suggested that if the identical statement is being made to distinguish each reference from an independent claim, as in the instant petition, then the statement should simply be made once in the petition. (E.g., "Regarding independent claim 1, none of the references disclose . . . .")) Also, the discussion of the references is not sufficiently detailed. The description of each reference is only a few sentences long and gives only a cursory description.

Additionally, the petition fails to identify which references are deemed most closely related by applicants. The petition states that "Woolcott pointed out three references deemed most closely related to the claimed subject matter". However, applicants are required to identify which references are deemed most closely related. Also, only those references which are deemed most closely related should be listed in the petition. References considered by applicant to be "of interest" should not be included.

Petition to Make Special **DISMISSED**.

Petitioner is given one opportunity to perfect the petition. Any request for reconsideration must be filed within TWO MONTHS of the mail date of this decision.

Until the renewed petition is submitted, the application will be returned to the examiner's docket to await treatment on the merits in the normal order of examination.



Pinchus M. Laufer  
Special Program Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
Computer Architecture, Software and Information Security  
571-272-3599